Warts all small, hair short.....**phyllira.**
Wart i small, about one-fourth the size of wart ii; wart ii without shining base.
Hairs without distinct barbules.
No dorsal line.....**nais.**
Dorsal line distinct, subdorsal broken.....**michabo.**
Dorsal and subdorsal lines distinct, subventral broken.....**arge.**

## ADDITIONAL NOTES ON TRYPETIDÆ.

BY R. W. DOANE.

It is with a good deal of hesitancy that I dare to take issue with so eminent authority on Diptera as Mr. Coquillett. But since his recent paper on Trypetidæ (JOUR. N. Y. ENTO. SOC., Vol. 7, no. 4) appeared I have been asked to say what I thought of the synonomy as therein set forth. As the paper shows evidence of having been hastily thrown together and as I still have before me all the types described in Vol. 7, no. 2 of the same journal it may not be amiss to call attention to some of the points in the original descriptions that seem to have been entirely overlooked and perhaps add a few notes.

*Spilographa setosa* Doane differs from *S. flavonotata* in the following particulars.—No trace of lighter markings on thorax; dark instead of pale bristles on hind tibiæ; posterior femora with brownish bristles near tip; more brown on basal portion of the wing; bristles on the third vein extending beyond the anterior cross vein.

*Trypeta straminea* Doane differs from *T. occidentalis* Snow in the following particulars.—Very much smaller, only about half as large; dark reddish yellow instead of lighter yellow; pile on thorax and abdomen not so long or dense; wings comparatively narrower. Every one of these characters is constant throughout a large series of both species. They can not possibly be confused.

*Eurosta conspurcata* Doane differs from *E. reticulata* Snow in the following particulars.—Smaller; thorax lighter brown; no light stripe on abdomen; the ring is much longer in proportion to its breadth; the hyaline spots are larger and somewhat differently arranged especially in the posterior portion of the wing, and there are not so many small yellow spots. I have only a single male specimen of this species but it is perfect and well preserved and looks so wholly unlike any of

the specimens of *E. reticulata* that I have before me that I cannot but believe it to be a distinct species.

*Eutreta nora* Doane differs from Loew's description of *Tephritis platyptera* in the following particulars.—Front not narrowed anteriorly, equals much more than half the width of the head; abdomen dark velvety brown with a narrow median longitudinal grayish line, but with no black spots; third vein with bristles. Lowe's description was drawn from a single badly preserved specimen, so of course there is a possibility of it not being accurate but as it stands it does not describe the specimen now before me.

*Tephritis californica* Doane and *Urellia pacifica* Doane.—This of course is the worst blunder of the whole lot. To declare that two forms belong to the same species when they are so wholly unlike as to leave little doubt that they even belonged to different genera is carrying things a little too far. Indeed the differences are so great that to point them out would simply mean to rewrite the description of each one. So I refer to the original description. If they cannot be understood look at the pictures of the wings. There is no possibility of them being confused. Neither of them corresponds at all with the description of *Euaresta araneosa* Coq., and as it is evident that the description of *T. californica* and *U. pacifica* have not been closely studied when they were declared to be synonyms of this species it is not worth while again going into detail. Again I refer to the original description.

As to the true generic position of several of these forms I expressed myself as being in some doubt as all generic tables given heretofore were based almost entirely upon the wing markings and I did not have the original descriptions of all the genera before me. When, however, I could not determine by the wing markings to which of two genera any form belonged I studied the general characters of the body and placed it in the genus to which it seemed the most closely related. I believe by this method I came nearer indicating their true relationship than can be done by simply studying the wing markings alone.